

Application No. 09/732,837
Amendment dated November 14, 2003
Reply to Office Action of August 27, 2003

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for considering the present application. In the Office Action dated August 27, 2003, claims 1-10 are pending in the application. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner for reconsideration of the claims.

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Claim 4 has been amended to clarify the antecedent basis for the optical fiber network by providing the optical fiber network before the second teleport station is mentioned. Also, claim 4 has been amended to clarify that the second teleport station is coupled to the first teleport station through the optical fiber network and the satellite; and that the irregularity is detected in said optical fiber "network". Form has been improved by changing "whereupon" to "and upon".

Claims 1 and 3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Adiwoso* (6,067,453). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 1 is directed to a communication system that has a first teleport station, a first user, and a satellite that couples the first teleport station to the first user. A network access point is coupled to the Internet and the teleport station. The network access point is coupled to the teleport station through an optical fiber. On the bottom of page 2 and continuing on page 3 of the Office Action the Examiner states that the *Adiwoso* reference teaches an, "Internet access point coupled to the Internet (figure 1 (37)) and the first teleport station, said network access point coupled to the first teleport station through an optical fiber." The Examiner points to Col. 5, lines 1-5, for this teaching. Applicant

Application No. 09/732,837
Amendment dated November 14, 2003
Reply to Office Action of August 27, 2003

disagrees with the Examiner's assessment of this statement. The sentences the Examiner refers to begin on Col. 4, line 66 and states, "Additionally, gateway 30a may provide a high-speed, broadband connection that allows user terminals to access information available on the Internet. In the example of FIG. 1, this service is available via an Internet access point (IAP) 37 connection. Internet access point 37 may comprise a large fiber-optic cable link providing information access at an extremely high bandwidth (e.g., gigahertz)." Applicant agrees that reference to a fiber-optic cable link is taught. Claim 1, however, recites that the network access point is coupled to the first teleport station through an optical fiber. The Internet access point 37 is referred to as a large fiber-optic cable link, but no teaching or suggestion is provided in *Adiwoso* for coupling the gateway 30 to the IAP 37 through an optical fiber. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests the Examiner for reconsideration of claim 1.

Likewise, claim 3 is a further limitation of claim 1 and should be allowable for the same reasons set forth above.

Claims 2 and 4-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Adiwoso* in view of *Wiedeman* (6,160,994). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 2 should be allowable for the same reasons set forth above. That is, the *Adiwoso* reference fails to teach that a teleport station is coupled to a network access point through an optical fiber. The teaching of *Wiedeman* is set forth for disclosing the use of Ka band. However, the *Wiedeman* reference does not teach coupling a first

Application No. 09/732,837
Amendment dated November 14, 2003
Reply to Office Action of August 27, 2003

teleport station to a network access point through an optical fiber. Applicant therefore respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider this rejection.

With respect to claim 4, a communication system is recited that includes a satellite, a first teleport station, an optical fiber network, and a second teleport station coupled to the first teleport station through the optical fiber network and the satellite. The optical fiber network provides a primary communication link until an irregularity is detected in the optical fiber network. Upon the sensing of the irregularity, the communication is routed from the first teleport station to the second teleport station through the satellite. The Examiner points to Col. 7, lines 18-31 of the *Wiedeman* reference for disclosing the use of dual satellite and fiber networks to connect users. However, Applicants respectfully submit that this passage does not teach or suggest the use of a satellite as a backup to an optical fiber network. Col. 7, lines 18-31 describe that major cities and major metropolitan areas may be connected using an extensive fiber optic infrastructure. Smaller cities along the way may be coupled into the fiber optic trunks. Other areas that have no local optical fiber service may be provided with satellite service. No teaching or suggestion is provided for sensing an irregularity and routing the satellite communications from the first teleport station to the second teleport station through a satellite rather than an optical fiber. Applicant therefore respectfully requests the Examiner for reconsideration of this rejection.

Claim 5 is directed to a method of communicating between a first user in a first geographic region served by first satellite and a second user in a second geographic

Application No. 09/732,837
Amendment dated November 14, 2003
Reply to Office Action of August 27, 2003

region by directing communications from a first user to the first satellite, routing the communication from the first satellite to a first teleport station, routing the communication from the first teleport station to a second teleport station in a second geographic region by way of an optical fiber network, and routing the communication from the second teleport station to a user in the second geographic region. The Examiner with respect to claim 5 states, "Adiwoso disclosed operation over diverse geographic regions." Applicant respectfully submits that the steps described above with respect to claim 5 are not taught or suggested in the *Adiwoso* reference. Although a satellite and a gateway station is illustrated, no teaching or suggestion is provided for routing the communication from the first teleport station to the second teleport station in the second geographic region by way of an optical fiber network. Applicant therefore respectfully requests the Examiner for a reconsideration of claim 5.

Claims 6 and 7 are dependent upon claim 5 and recite that routing the communication from the second teleport station to the user in the second geographic region is respectively performed using an optical fiber or a second satellite. The *Wiedeman* reference also fails to teach or suggest such steps. Applicant therefore respectfully request the Examiner for reconsideration of claims 6 and 7.

Likewise, claim 8 is also dependent upon claim 5 and provides further limitations thereto. Applicant therefore respectfully requests the Examiner for a reconsideration of claim 8.

Application No. 09/732,837
Amendment dated November 14, 2003
Reply to Office Action of August 27, 2003


Claim 9 is also an independent claim directed to a method of operating a communication system. Claim 9 recites, "generating a plurality of spot beams directed to a respective plurality of teleport stations from a satellite, interconnecting the plurality of teleport stations with an optical communication network; in normal operating conditions, directing a communication from a first of said teleport stations through said satellite to a first user; and when the second teleport station is encumbered, directing the communications through an optical link." The Examiner points to Col. 8, lines 10-15. However, Applicant can find no suggestion in this passage for directing a communication from a first of said plurality of teleport stations through said satellite to a first user during normal operations and when the teleport station is encumbered, directing the communications through an optical link. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner for a reconsideration of this rejection as well.

Further, claim 10 is a further limitation of claim 9 and should be allowable for the same reasons set forth above.

Application No. 09/732,837
Amendment dated November 14, 2003
Reply to Office Action of August 27, 2003

In light of the remarks above, Applicant submits that all objections and rejections are now overcome. The application is now in condition for allowance and expeditious notice thereof is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,


Vijayalakshmi D. Duraiswamy
Reg. No. 31,505
Attorney for Applicant

HUGHES ELECTRONICS CORPORATION
RE/R11/A109
P. O. Box 956
El Segundo, CA 90245-0956
Telephone: (310) 964-0733